

parking structure and cafe! Let's keep Runyon Canyon a wilderness area for all of us and our dogs to enjoy!

<http://www.petitionbuzz.com/.../preserve-and-protect-runyon-c...>

From: Anastasia
Subject: Re: Example of the Repeated Misrepresentations
Date: July 20, 2016 at 2:28 AM JST
To: Don

Dear Don,

As you know there are many statements flowing on both sides of this aisle. Some perpetuated by you and/or your board members and some by others from the groups and individuals against FORC.

I have attempted to negotiate a calmer approach to this situation by speaking to you and to Bob (CPR) individually and putting you together. That effort seemed to be going forward until the recent Parks committee meeting where the stakeholders voted 47 to 2 to request cancellation of the MOU between RAP & FORC. Your reaction to that has begun a negative campaign with mistruths. The pot cannot call the kettle black. NEITHER side should be disseminating false statements or assumptions.

We have nearly 3000 registered stakeholders in our NC. HHWNC represents everyone equally. HOWEVER, we would be hard pressed as individuals to not have personal feelings when dealing neighbor to neighbor.

While I understand your frustrations I do not understand the difficulty you seem to have with taking ownership of the birth of this situation and its continuing controversy. This was born from deception by members of your board. And I am not speaking of hearsay, but statements made directly to me as president of HHWNC.

As I write this, members of your board continue to state falsehoods re HHWNC and our long involvement and commitment to RUNYON CANYON - long before your group was formed. At least 12-14 years before that I am personally aware of. If you are unaware of this, evidence can be provided.

You and FORC "paid members" do not own RUNYON CANYON. The park belongs to all the citizens of our city and is the centerpiece of our NC and its entire community. It is under the control of RAP with oversight by CD4. It is in the domain of HHWNC - a duly elected board by the community stakeholders. At no charge. You are not the sole keepers of the keys.

My suggestion to all sides is to allow the process set up under the City Charter of Los Angeles to continue. What happens after that may involve a series of discussions and negotiations with all parties concerned. But the people who are stakeholders in this community have a right to speak. You may not like what some of them have to say, but this trail began at your front door.

I continue to receive emails from stakeholders who don't even know CPR who are upset by FORC. I received another one this morning. The reason that there is confusion over your "Vision Plan" is because of the way you represented it. Even your own board members agree with that. Your lack of outreach to the actual residents in and surrounding RC created this lack of trust. Building it back is not enhanced by furthering inflammatory statements and perpetuating mistruths.

This debacle cost the city, the community, CD4, RAP, multiple friendships, the NC and on and on, a great deal of stress and animosity. It's time to stop. If there are statements that need rebuttals, that can be accomplished at the board meeting. Keeping BOTH sides civil is my job, and not an easy one. Emotions are running high.

I suggest these communications cease and we move forward. The meeting is tomorrow. One day should be possible.

Regards,

Anastasia

Anastasia



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

On Jul 19, 2016, at 6:49 AM, Don Andres <andres2007@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

Attachments:

<image001.png>

From:

Subject:

Re: Example of the Repeated Misrepresentations

Date:

July 20, 2016 at 9:54 AM JST

To:

Don

I would like to de-escalate the acrimony which seems to be building. It is counter-productive.

I do not want to spread untruthful or inaccurate information. That is why I asked you very simple, but specific questions and asked that you give me a response before tomorrow's meeting. My July 15 email to you read, in part:

It is my recollection from our last conversation that you confirmed to me that:

- (1) Manuel contributed money to FORC;
- (2) After his contribution, FORC's board discussed whether it would oppose his plans to build a 9,500 sq ft house on 3003 Runyon;
- (3) After discussing this issue, FORC voted (the term "voted" should be changed to "decided") to remain silent and not oppose the 9,500 sq ft house in Runyon.

The above facts are what I recall from our conversation. Please advise me whether any of that is incorrect prior to Wednesday's meeting as I will be discussing this before the council and do not want to misstate our conversation. Additionally, we would like to know how much FORC received from [redacted] and whether there were any conversations about his wanting to build the house when he gave FORC the money. Finally, how much money in total has FORC raised and how much has it given to RAP. In our discussions we have talked about making sure our facts are correct and about transparency. Providing this information to me would show that there is transparency.

You never confirmed with me that any of this was incorrect, rather you wrote the email below claiming that we were spreading false information and sent it to everyone on the list. In your email, I believe that you take issue with the term "voted." I do recall you telling me that you and other FORC members discussed whether or not to add your voice to the opposition but decided not to voice a formal opposition from FORC to the development. I guess I considered that a vote. Forgive me. I will not use the term voted again regarding this issue - I will replace it with "decided," unless you now claim that is not true. Please respond to the specific inquiries listed in blue above. As a 501(c)(3) organization who collects money from the public under color of the MOU granted to you by the City, you must be transparent.

Again, please confirm or correct those facts above and let me know how much Mr. Valencia gave FORC, how much has FORC raised in total and how much has it given to RAP. Please provide me this simple information before 1:00 p.m. tomorrow P.D.T. so that I can have it in time to add it to my presentation as I want to speak with accurate facts.

Thank you.

Robert [redacted]

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

In a message dated 7/19/2016 6:49:30 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time,

[Quoted text hidden]

From:

Don

Subject:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

RE: Example of the Repeated Misrepresentations

Date:

July 21, 2016 at 1:49 AM JST

To:

✓ -

Dear Bob,

Yes it is all counter-productive – our Board of Directors is reticent to respond based on every Foundation response being misinterpreted or misconstrued for some other purpose – resulting in a lack of trust. As we have already stated to you and is the basis of a nonprofit foundation, there were no conditions attached to his donation.

That being said, we have been transparent and offer the following information so that you can brief the facts correctly:

1. Manny _____ attended our first fundraising event as a guest of Randal Kleiser in Feb 2015 and donated \$1000 because he loves the park and was supportive of the Foundation's efforts to protect and preserve the park. His donation along with the other FORC Founders was posted in the park for several months in late 2015 and early 2016.
2. Some months later in April 2015, we heard about a proposed development at 3003 Runyon Canyon Road. Since the mission of the Foundation is fundraising for the park, personal property and related permits are not part of our mission. Therefore, there was no action by the Foundation Board. There was no vote or decision to be made – it is out of the scope of our mission per our understanding of IRS rules.
3. However, individual Board Members, having other roles in the community, brought the subject property to the attention of the MDRB and the Hillside Federation which are the appropriate forums concerning personal properties and related permits. It was also brought to the attention of the SMMC. Several meetings were held and each meeting was attended by Foundation individuals opposing the proposed project. I believe HHWNC members were also at the MDRB Meetings. Those organizations took the appropriate action on the property. I do not know if the HHWNC voted on the subject property.
4. There were NO conversations with Mr. _____ regarding his property, and there was no favor given to Mr. Valencia for his donation per IRS regulations.

Our financial statements are posted on our website and the IRS returns are accessible to the public, and we have delineated in a separate email to you and Anastasia where we spent funds for the park. No funds to date have been given to Rec & Parks. We discuss with Rec & Parks whether it makes sense for the Foundation to pay directly for any improvement.

We are moving forward in a more positive manner to work for the good of Runyon and hope you and CPR will join us in helping to preserve and protect the park.

Thank you,

Don

Don

President

Friends of Runyon Canyon Foundation

 Friends of Runyon Canyon.org

From:

Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 8:55 PM

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]